

**From:** Michael Thigpen  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Tue, Jun 3, 2003 10:26 AM  
**Subject:** <No Subject>

I watched the program on c-span you and Michael did a great job . The public need more people like you and Michael.

Thanks Michael Thigpen AB4MT

**From:** manpowera@pdkintl.org  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Tue, Jun 3, 2003 11:20 AM  
**Subject:** Thank You!

Thank you for saying what so many of us wanted to say! I thank you for putting so much thought into your response to the rule changes and being so eloquent. Stephanie Blake

**From:** Peter Merlin  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Tue, Jun 3, 2003 11:23 AM  
**Subject:** <No Subject>

Thank you for your efforts to stop the ruling.  
Peter F Merlin

**From:** Christopher Frick  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Tue, Jun 3, 2003 12:15 PM  
**Subject:** I do not support your new ruling

Your arguments that there are new channels to gain information and that no one was hurt when there were only a few broadcast stations are insubstantial and pointless.

On the first point there are too few people connected to the internet and too few of the sources are peer reviewed to make this a viable argument.

On the second point the old days of which you have referred were before the power of television and broadcast was fully realized.

It has been hard enough to watch my fellow Americans listen to and believe the propaganda that came from the right-wing media outlets that dominate broadcast and cable these days. These are angry hate-filled bullying voices. In my life I have watched the death of discourse and true debate. I have watched this on mass market television. The fundamental skills of democracy are no longer visible through existing mass market media.

I concede that broadcasters have always had to take the sponsors views into account but, the impartial voices are really gone from mass-media.

Massive consolidation of media ownership will result in the marginalization of any opinions counter to those that benefit the wealthiest and most powerful voices.

I really don't agree with your statement that this is pro-consumer. This is an example of the kind of "spin" that is so cynically used by our administration and supported by mass media.

The FCC should be trying to protect the diversity of opinions in this great country not eliminating diversity as you have done.

You have made a decision that will make America uglier, less tolerant, more stupid, and less free.

Take no pride in this. You acted as puppets.

Christopher Frick  
2915 East Republican Street  
Seattle, WA 98112

**From:** jared@radionationals.com  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein, Michael Copps  
**Date:** Tue, Jun 3, 2003 1:26 PM  
**Subject:** Thank you for your dissenting votes

I wanted to say thank you for dissenting on the issue of station ownership. All too often I fear that our leaders are only complained to, and never thanked when they show true leadership quality in their voting. Unfortunately for the American people, your votes were in the minority. At a time when Americans' civil liberties are most at risk, we need diversity in our broadcasting. What has happened to radio is shameful. The widespread practice of payola (once investigated by congress, now largely ignored) has increased tenfold. No musician can hope to be successful without airplay on Clear Channel stations. No musician can play at a Clear Channel venue who is not played on Clear Channel Stations. No musician can receive significant airplay on a Clear Channel station without hiring the "Independent Radio Promoters" that Clear Channel works with. And yet we do nothing. Just because the payola is now laundered through a middle man, it is legal and acceptable?

What happens when our television broadcasts move the same direction? Imagine news stories if ABC, NBC, and CBS had been owned by Enron, or Worldcom.

I digress. I merely wanted to say thank you for having the wisdom to truly look at the issue at hand, and stand up to the pressures of big business in the interest of the American people.

Sincerely,  
Jared Clifton

**From:** Clarence Gilles  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Tue, Jun 3, 2003 4:22 PM  
**Subject:** Recent FCC ruling

I am a republican but am deeply concerned about the recent FCC ruling. We have one newspaper in our city of 1MM people and it is totally Democratic with no editorials stating Republican view points in a positive manner. It really doesn't matter which party a corporation or paper backs, but whatever it is it is one sided news and view points. Radio and TV broadcasting plus newspapers are the most potent forms of communication and regulating them should not be taken lightly. Big means power and whoever is the biggest has the most power. We rely on competition in the same marketplaces to get proper and alternate perspectives. The recent ruling is not a Democrat vs. Republican perspective, it is the access to different perspectives and communication alternatives. I hope you reconsider this ruling.

Clarence Gilles  
President  
TrackingSolutions, Inc.  
10847 Yankee Street  
Dayton, OH 45458  
Phone: 888-336-8439  
Fax: 937-885-3580  
cgilles@trackingsolutionsinc.com  
www.trackingsolutionsinc.com

**From:** sherry.pole@verizon.net  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Tue, Jun 3, 2003 4:01 PM  
**Subject:** Please oppose media deregulation and demand public hearings

Dear Chairman Powell,

cc: FCC Commissioners  
cc: Sen. Wyden

I urge you to vote to protect the public interest by dropping the FCC's plans to end critical safeguards designed to ensure diversity of media ownership and to ensure that there are public hearings to discuss how such proposals will affect Oregon and the nation.

Sincerely,  
Sherry Pollock  
423 Brook St.  
Silverton, OR 97381

**From:** cabblackmore@aol.com  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Tue, Jun 3, 2003 4:01 PM  
**Subject:** Please oppose media deregulation and demand public hearings

Dear Chairman Powell,

cc: FCC Commissioners  
cc: Sen. Wyden

I urge you to vote to protect the public interest by dropping the FCC's plans to end critical safeguards designed to ensure diversity of media ownership and to ensure that there are public hearings to discuss how such proposals will affect Oregon and the nation.

Sincerely,  
Carolyn Blackmore  
0408 S.W. Nebraska  
Portland, OR 97239



**From:** jalh@cavenet.com  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Tue, Jun 3, 2003 3:54 PM  
**Subject:** Please oppose media deregulation and demand public hearings

Dear Chairman Powell,

cc. FCC Commissioners  
cc: Sen. Wyden

I urge you to vote to protect the public interest by dropping the FCC's plans to end critical safeguards designed to ensure diversity of media ownership and to ensure that there are public hearings to discuss how such proposals will affect Oregon and the nation.

Sincerely,  
Les & Judy Hoyle  
765 Mesa Verde Drive  
Cave Junction, OR 97523

**From:** jalh@cavenet.com  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Tue, Jun 3, 2003 3:53 PM  
**Subject:** Please oppose media deregulation and demand public hearings

Dear Chairman Powell,

cc: FCC Commissioners  
cc: Sen. Wyden

I urge you to vote to protect the public interest by dropping the FCC's plans to end critical safeguards designed to ensure diversity of media ownership and to ensure that there are public hearings to discuss how such proposals will affect Oregon and the nation.

Sincerely,  
Les & Judy Hoyle  
765 Mesa Verde Drive  
Cave Junction, OR 97523

**From:** jpapa123@aol.com  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Tue, Jun 3, 2003 3:52 PM  
**Subject:** Oppose media deregulation and demand public hearings

Dear FCC Commissioners and Chairman Powell,

cc: my members of Congress

I urge you to vote to protect the public interest by dropping the FCC's plans to end critical safeguards designed to ensure diversity of media ownership and to delay the unnecessarily rushed vote on media ownership scheduled for June 2nd. This type of legislation would counter the effects of free speech that our country is founded on. Already it is increasingly difficult to find real news that is not submitted to the media by a corporate public relations firm. Diversity of media is essential to democracy.

Sincerely,  
Jennifer Papa  
Jennifer Papa  
69 Oliver Place  
Ringwood, NJ 07456

**From:** cabblackmore@aol.com  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Tue, Jun 3, 2003 3:52 PM  
**Subject:** Please oppose media deregulation and demand public hearings

Dear Chairman Powell,

cc: FCC Commissioners  
cc: Sen. Wyden

I urge you to vote to protect the public interest by dropping the FCC's plans to end critical safeguards designed to ensure diversity of media ownership and to ensure that there are public hearings to discuss how such proposals will affect Oregon and the nation.

Sincerely,  
Carolyn Blackmore  
0408 S.W. Nebraska  
Portland, OR 97239

**From:** Robert C. Douglas Jr.  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Tue, Jun 3, 2003 12:02 AM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Robert C. Douglas Jr. (nwearthart@earthlink.net) writes:

Dear Commissioner Adelstein,

I want to thank you for both your vote against the further deregulation of the media today and your well-reasoned article published on Common Dreams.org. As a nation our citizens seem to be in the grips of a hostile corporate take over and your courage to stand against this tide is admirable and again I thank you for it for what is at stake here is our democracy.

Sincerely,  
Robert C. Douglas Jr.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 216.26.5.114  
Remote IP address: 216.26.5.114

**From:** Dan Kelleher  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Tue, Jun 3, 2003 12:02 AM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Dan Kelleher (dkelleher@charter.net) writes:

Just read your dissenting opinion and am relieved to find at least one person who speaks the truth. A radio broadcast engineer since 1972, I have seen the business decline greatly. The FCC has failed to define, much less protect, "the public interest". "The marketplace" does not define "the public interest". Keep on keeping on. You will be a hero if the public ever realizes how much they have lost. What has already happened in radio will spread elsewhere with similar results. Thanks for presenting an opinion based on reality and practicality.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 68.118.234.122  
Remote IP address: 68.118.234.122

**From:** Bud Templin  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Tue, Jun 3, 2003 12:04 AM  
**Subject:** Media deregulation

Dear Commissioner Abernathy; I wish to express my extreme outrage at the action taken by yourself and the two Republican commissioners today. I object to your craven catering to narrow corporate interests over the desires of the broader public interest. I trust that your corporate masters will be very (financially) grateful to yourself and the GOP. Which of course is obviously the whole point of this disgraceful exercise. I can only hope that a roused public will inform congress that the media in a free society is not simply a cash cow for an ever narrower oligarchy.- (even if that oligarchy supports your particular political party and lifestyle.) I hope that you have waken a sleeping giant that will sweep you and your ilk from this government. Don't worry- you no doubt have very lucrative positions being kept warm for you representing those very industries that you are entrusted by the people of this country to regulate in their interest. With people like you in the government, it is impossible not to be cynical. Bud Templin

**From:** Mcinerneypf@aol.com  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Tue, Jun 3, 2003 12:05 AM  
**Subject:** Outrageous!!

To the majority Republicans,

Your decision to-day was incredible and flies in the face of all democratic values in our society.

Unless it is reversed here is one less Republican vote in 2004.

The cumulative impact of these type of decisions is what will ensure a one-term presidency for George Bush.

Mr. Powell , you appear to be an intelligent man...please resign and get a real job outside Washington,

My concern is that in your present position you are compromising your father, who was always respected for his integrity and honesty. His statements recently are becoming more orchestrated and are straining our credibility worldwide.

It is clear that the public wants to limit the monopolisation of the media, and the F.C.C. has been a recipient of an overwhelming amount of e-mail to that effect.

To hear you question the validity of that input to-day was outrageous and insulting.

Your arrogance is astounding.

Starting to-morrow, I will exert every effort to have this decision reversed.

Sincerely,

Peter McInerney.



**From:** sj McClellan  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Tue, Jun 3, 2003 12:07 AM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

sj McClellan (smac45@juno.com) writes:

Thankd you for your insight and work to stop the money grabbing schemes by the mega companies.  
Please continue to help keep OUR airwaves free. Thank you.

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 67.75.228.242  
Remote IP address: 67.75.228.242

**From:** Bill  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Tue, Jun 3, 2003 12:07 AM  
**Subject:** FCC- who do your rules serve ?

Mr. Chairman Michael K. Powell,

Besides the rather few remaining media conglomerates, Who does your media ownership deregulation today serve?

I do not believe ANYONE (that is ANY SINGLE PERSON !) besides large media conglomerate corporations will benefit from this change. I am deeply saddened and angered that my tax money is paying for you to do this damage to the diversity of media control - and in such a big, quiet hurry with the smallest legally required amount of public disclosure and comment. I'm sure it's a small drop in the bucket beside whatever you get in pay from those large media conglomerate folks who gain from this but it is a grave misuse of your office

SHAME ON YOU !

"Media ownership rules are intended to protect and advance the cherished values of diversity, localism and competition".

-If you think your action today supports your words then why didn't you hold adequate hearings to explain and discuss how this rule change will help diversity, localism and competition ?

William D Noble  
14439 120 Place N.E.  
Kirkland, Wa. 98034 USA

**CC:** Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein, FCC  
FCCINFO, FOIA, Webmaster, Campaignlaw, jay.inslee@mail.house.gov,  
senator\_murray@murray.senate.gov, ECFS

**From:** howell  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Tue, Jun 3, 2003 12:11 AM  
**Subject:** Broadcast Ownership Rules

Dear Ms. Abernathy:

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. Many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

/s/James A., Howell\_\_\_\_  
Dr. James A. Howell  
912 Weaver Avenue  
Kalamazoo, MI 49006-5539

**From:** Robert C. Douglas Jr.  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Tue, Jun 3, 2003 12:12 AM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Robert C. Douglas Jr. (nwearthart@earthlink.net) writes:

Dear Commissioner Adelstien,

I want to thank you for both your vote against the further deregulation of the media today and your well-reasoned article published on Common Dreams.org. As a nation our citizens seem to be in the grips of a hostile corporate take over and your courage to stand against this tide is admirable and again I thank you for it for what is at stake here is our democracy.

Sincerely,  
Robert C. Douglas Jr.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 216.26.5.114  
Remote IP address: 216.26.5.114

**From:** BTM  
**To:** Mike Powell, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Kathleen Abernathy, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Tue, Jun 3, 2003 12:15 AM  
**Subject:** You should be ashamed of yourself

When communication companies own entire markets they will have monopolies on advertising in those markets.

You should be ashamed of yourselves.

**From:** Maureen Wojtczak  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Tue, Jun 3, 2003 12:43 AM  
**Subject:** FCC changes

I want to share my concerns regarding the planned changes with the FCC and disagree with your opinion regarding this. The American people need their voice heard and should be allowed to testify-as many of them that want to-before any changes are made. It saddens me deeply that the commission would go ahead with something like this when it is clear many American people have great concerns. I must ask, Are we still "for the people" and "By the people" government, or have we already become the "for the corporations" and "by the corporations" government? Can (or should I say WILL) the FCC really ignore the people's will on this?

Maureen Wojtczak  
a private citizen and registered republican

**From:** Ken Solheim  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Tue, Jun 3, 2003 1:01 AM  
**Subject:** Ruling to Consolidate Media Powers

Mr. Powell,

In an interview today I heard you say that you had listened to the voice of the public and took that voice into consideration when casting your vote today on the consolidation plan.

I am perplexed by this comment since there was only one public opportunity for you to hear from the public. The only other opportunities available to the general public were via phone calls, e-mails, petitions and the like.

I do not believe the public was well served by this decision, to place even more of the public airways into the hands of a few media conglomerates. This will do nothing to give opportunity to a wider variety of opinion - to more diversity as stated in the FCC's strategic goals.

Similarly I believe coverage of local issues will be reduced as corporate offices will pre-format news and feature stories leaving even less space or time for truly local issues.

The public is not being well served and I urge you to reconsider.

Thank you,

Kenneth B. Solheim

**CC:** Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

**From:** Jill Jordan  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Tue, Jun 3, 2003 1:05 AM  
**Subject:** Your job is Communication?

No Wonder you were part of a HORRIBLE decision...look at yourself:

[www.fcc.gov/commissioners/abernathy/](http://www.fcc.gov/commissioners/abernathy/)  
contrary to the 2 members of the commission that know what is in the publics best interest your website is as lacking substance and information as you are.

Did you wear a pretty blue dress to get you job?

I am embarassed to share your gender!

How big was your pay off?

Jill Heryford

=====

Jill Heryford  
geek on the loose

---

Do you Yahoo!?  
Yahoo! Calendar - Free online calendar with sync to Outlook(TM).  
<http://calendar.yahoo.com>



**From:** Chuck Sivertsen  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy, KM KJMWEB  
**Date:** Tue, Jun 3, 2003 1:29 AM  
**Subject:** Fwd: FCC decision & your TV appearances on Charlie Rose & ABC's "This Week."

>From: "Chuck Sivertsen" <chucksivertsen@hotmail.com>  
>To: mpowell@fcc.gov  
>CC: ChuckSivertsen@hotmail.com  
>Subject: FCC decision & your TV appearances on Charlie Rose & ABC's "This  
>Week."  
>Date: Tue, 03 Jun 2003 01:26:59 -0400  
>  
>Mr. Chairman:  
>I've been a broadcaster for more than 30 years ('been paid for it for 30),  
>21 with ABC News, radio.  
>  
>I've worked in small, medium and large markets, a variety of jobs.  
>  
>I'm confused not only about your agency's decision, and about things you  
>said and didn't say on recent TV appearances.  
>  
>Your dismissal of "anecdotes" about radio consolidation is troubling and  
>insulting. Your agency's decisions affect both people working in the  
>industry and listeners, and our livelihoods, which pay your salary.  
>Protecting the public interest of our publicly-owned radio spectrum is your  
>job.  
>  
>The purpose here is not to annoy or insult YOU. But I am annoyed and  
>insulted to be told that, for instance, a company that owns a major movie  
>studio, a small "independent" studio, provides internet access, owns  
>websites, video stores, TV and radio networks, TV and radio stations, cable  
>channels, billboards, TV syndication rights and TV production companies  
>needs help making sure it stays profitable.  
>  
>You, Mr. Powell, would be annoyed if the rules changes over the years led  
>to a highly successful, profitable, AM radio station, WSTC in Stamford,  
>Conn., and it's marginally successful FM, WKHL, to be bought by a  
>partnership, much of the veteran staff fired, local studios closed, studios  
>opened 10 miles and two towns away, and when there's a major fire in an  
>apartment complex right by interstate 95, visible to thousands of motorists  
>in the middle of morning drive-time, there's no mention of it on the news.  
>-And, no longer any newsroom number to dial to tell them about it...just a  
>main station number and voicemail.  
>  
>Maybe, you, Mr. Powell, would be annoyed if you knew any of the people  
>working in the industry you regulate who have lost jobs, or listeners who  
>have lost radio stations, formats, local news and programming. Maybe the  
>world is different inside the Beltway. Outside, the ownership of WARM Radio  
>in Scranton, PA changed several times over the past 15 years, staffers  
>fired, formats changed, audiences driven away, until during a recent  
>rebuilding process, the owners decided to "get the station ready for sale"  
>by firing the entire staff, not only right before Christmas, but right  
>after the start of an annual holiday charity fund drive.

>

>Annoying? Ithaca, New York used to be a vibrant small market with competing  
>radio stations. Now, it's possible and...the reality...for one owner to  
>have most of them...with nearly no local programming or news.

>

>A friend of mine is working for KTRH Radio in Houston, but the owner, Clear  
>Channel, requires her to do local news for WOAI in San Antonio as well  
>during her shift...except. .she's in Houston...not San Antonio.

>

>Every person in this industry has these "anecdotes."

>

>The radio industry is doing away with even minimum wage jobs that provided  
>the start that eventually got me to ABC. Perhaps you could have informed us  
>where new talent is going to come from, where it can start, if those jobs  
>are replaced by network syndication and automation...or just eliminated.

>

>Apparently, it's no longer enough to let unsuccessful station owners sell  
>their properties to others...we must have government reduce competition and  
>require nothing of broadcasters to justify their holding licenses in  
>perpetuity, regulated by an agency paid by me and other taxpayers. I am in  
>essense paying for the privilege of big companies reducing choices and  
>jobs in my industry.

>

>You say this will not happen in TV. Why not? You give no reason except  
>vague talk about the interests of media owners. Have they told you they  
>won't do what they've done to radio? What evidence is there? During two  
>national TV appearances you did not say. You say the rules are old and  
>outdated.

>But you did not have one example...of harm.

>

>You say radio was dying before deregulation of the '90's. My colleagues and  
>I in the industry know this to be not true. Maybe you misspoke. Did you ask  
>any of us? Who was the last local salesperson, local news reporter, local  
>talk show host or programmer...or community leader...civic leader...you  
>spoke to? Did you speak to any in, say, Scranton, Tampa, Stamford, Austin,  
>Minot or Fresno?

>

>Can you name ONE town that has a better radio station, employing more  
>people, with more local news, better local news, and more local programming  
>today than ten years ago? -A local TV station?

>

>You say the Big Five media companies control maybe 20 per cent of the TV  
>channels in the U.S. Two out of ten? One out of every five? One out of  
>every five stations in America are unavailable to anyone else? And there is  
>no standard other than airing obscenities in determining their fitness to  
>hang onto licenses forever?

>

>Mr. Powell, you could have chosen to dismiss anecdotes with some, or at  
>least, one...of your own.

>You didn't even have an example of how a big media company is a victim. You  
>had not one example of how years of deregulation has HELPED the industry  
>at all. Had you asked any of us IN it who are not millionaires, just  
>working stiffs, happy in our jobs, loving the mediums of radio & TV,  
>alarmed and demoralized by the now long term direction of the business, you  
>would have gotten some information about the effects of FCC decisions and  
>Congressional actions.

>

>Thankyou for reading this. I respect you and wish you well. I have no  
>respect for your decision, or for your pathetic attempts to explain it. You  
>and your colleagues in government...work for us.

>

>Sincerely, Chuck Sivertsen.

>

---

Protect your PC - get McAfee.com VirusScan Online  
<http://clinic.mcafee.com/clinic/ibuy/campaign.asp?cid=3963>

**From:** Ramona Tung  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Tue, Jun 3, 2003 2:09 AM  
**Subject:** recent FCC ruling

I'm disappointed with the recent FCC ruling allowing further media consolidation.

The fewer opinions we get, the more our democracy is at stake.

Our democracy is at stake when we get only limited news - and the FCC's recent ruling does limit our news.

Please reconsider the FCC ruling allowing further media consolidation.

-Ramona

**From:** DrAlanLipman@aol.com  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Tue, Jun 3, 2003 6:58 AM  
**Subject:** Testimony

Your testimony, which I saw this AM on CSPAN, was one of the most eloquent, comprehensive, passionate and forceful statements that I have seen.

What can we do?

**From:** Josh  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Tue, Jun 3, 2003 7:03 AM  
**Subject:** The FCC's 6/02/03 Ruling

I am extremely concerned with the ruling that your organization passed Yesterday. I have heard on the news that, since the plan to further deregulate the media came to the attention of the public, there was an unprecedented outcry against the plan. I understand that the American people used their first amendment rights in unprecedented numbers to send a message to the FCC that We the People do not want this change to rules we find sane and in our best interest. Please listen to us (and the members of the House and Senate) this time and reverse this ruling.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,  
Joshua Bryant